Application No. 09/649,122 Filed: August 28, 2000 TC Art Unit: 3626

Confirmation No.: 7057

REMARKS

The instant response is filed in response to the Office Action dated July 16, 2004. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-87 are currently pending.

Claims 1-87 stand rejected.

The official action indicates that the reply dated April 5, 2004 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because the amendment fails to argue why the newly amended claims overcome the prior art or record. Specifically, the reply fails to point out specific distinctions between the claims and the prior art of record that are believed to render the claims patentable over the prior art.

The Applicants respectfully point out that claims 1, 11, 19-20, 27-31, 35, 38, 40, 44, 46, 65, 67, 82, and 86-87 were amended, claims 15, 21, 25-26, 64, and 85 were canceled without prejudice, and arguments were presented as to why the amended claims overcome the rejections in the prior response dated April 5, 2004. With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based upon a public use or sale of the invention, the Applicants submitted a Declaration in the prior response attesting to the fact that the

Application No. 09/649,122 Filed: August 28, 2000 TC Art Unit: 3626

Confirmation No.: 7057

subject matter recited in claims 1-87 was not offered for sale more than one year prior to the earliest priority date of June 28, Although the assignee of the above-referenced application (Kronos Incorporated) sold a labor scheduling and optimization software product know as SMART SCHEDULER from at least 1993 to 1999, the Kronos software product did not contain the invention(s) claimed in the above-referenced application, as set forth in paragraph 8 of the Declaration.

Specifically, neither the SMART SCHEDULER software product nor the prior art of record, namely, USP 6,587,831, USP 6,574,605, USP Application 2001/0049619 Al, "Kronos announces release of Smart Scheduler software", and "Kronos unveils Smart Scheduler", teaches or suggests a method and system for forecasting business volume and workforce requirements with the aid of a computer system that is operative to calculate workforce requirements by resource leveling, as recited in base claims 1, 46, 82, and 86-87. More specifically, the prior art of record neither teaches nor suggests a resource leveling technique that includes determining valleys in a preliminary schedule, ranking the valleys, assigning at least one unassigned task to a highest-ranked valley, and repeating the steps of determining peaks, determining valleys, ranking the valleys and assigning at least one unassigned task, as

Application No. 09/649,122 Filed: August 28, 2000

TC Art Unit: 3626 Confirmation No.: 7057

recited in claims 1, 65, and 86-87. Such calculation of workforce requirements including resource leveling is described throughout the instant application, for example, see page 4, lines 15-22, of the application.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the reply to the prior Office Action is fully responsive, and that the rejections of claims 1-87 under 35 U.S.C. sections 101 and 102 contained in the prior Office Action are unwarranted and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned Attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of

Application No. 09/649,122 Filed: August 28, 2000 'TC Art Unit: 3626 Confirmation No.: 7057

the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

CHANDAN ADHIKARI ET AL.

Registration No. 39,196 Attorney for Applicants

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP Ten Post Office Square Boston, MA 02109

Telephone: (617) 542-2290 Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

REG/pjd Enclosure 309984